

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended.

Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter within Claims 5–7. *See*, Office Action at Page 4.

Claim 1 was objected to due to a typographical error, and has been amended accordingly. Additionally, the features recited by Claims 1 and 2 have been combined into new Claim 12, Claims 1 and 2 have been canceled without prejudice, and the claims depending from Claim 1 have been amended accordingly. Claims 3–8, 10 and 11 have been amended for reasons unrelated to patentability, i.e., to correct grammar. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1–4 and 8–11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Evensen (U.S. 2003/0153332). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Office Action opines that Evensen discloses all of the features recited by Claim 12 (i.e., original Claims 1 and 2) in Paragraphs 0016, 17 and FIG.3A. *See*, Office Action at Pages 2–3. Applicants respectfully disagree. Evensen discloses a method and system in a mobile communication network for providing enhanced user privacy when responding to a location request from a client requesting location information for a mobile terminal. When the location request (including an identifier for the requesting client, a codeword and a service identity) from the client is received by a mobile location node, a request for routing information (including the codeword from the location request) is sent from the mobile location node to the HLR/HSS. The codeword is then compared with a list in the HLR/HSS of approved codewords associated with the mobile terminal. The location request is accepted only if the codeword included in the location request matches a codeword from the codeword list. *See*, e.g., Paragraphs 0016, 17. And, in FIG. 3A, Evensen depicts a specific signaling interaction for this procedure. At best, Evensen simply discloses an authentication procedure for a location request from a client requesting location information for a mobile terminal. Accordingly, Evensen fails to teach (or even suggest) a procedure related to a location request in the activated state, as recited by Claim 12.

More particularly, Claim 12 recites a method for processing the location request against a target UE which has been in the activated state, beginning when the LCS system is aware

that the privacy profile of the target UE was updated. Specifically, Evensen fails to disclose at least the following elements recited by Claim 12.

Evensen fails to disclose the claimed "when a location service (LCS) system is aware that the privacy profile of the target UE was updated."

Evensen fails to disclose the claimed "for a location request in activated state against that UE, the LCS system performing a privacy check, if the location request passes the privacy check." Instead, Evensen merely discloses steps for processing a location request that has just been initiated from the client, however, the location request has not been authenticated by the LCS system, i.e., the LCS service requested by the location request has not been established, therefore, the location request is not in the activated state. Additionally, while Evensen discloses matching the codeword carried in the location request, Evensen fails to disclose performing a privacy check for a location request in the activated state.

Evensen fails to disclose the claimed "the LCS system initializing a cancellation procedure to the location request". Rather, if Evensen's codeword does not match the codeword from the codeword list, the LCS system will not accept the location request, i.e., the location request does not pass the authentication of the LCS system. However, as recited by Claim 12, if the location request does not pass the privacy check, the LCS system will initialize the cancellation procedure to the location request. Accordingly, the cancellation procedure is with respect to the location request in the activated state, and the LCS service established for the location request is terminated after the cancellation procedure. Applicants submit that a cancellation procedure would not be initialized for a location request that has not been activated, and, consequently, not accepting the location request, as Evensen teaches, is not the same as initializing a cancellation procedure with respect to the location request, as recited by Claim 12.

Consequently, Evensen fails to disclose all of the features recited by Claim 12.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 12 is allowable over Evensen. Furthermore, Claims 3–4 and 8–11, depending from Claim 12, are also allowable, at least for the reasons discussed above. Applicants also submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest many of the features recited by the dependent claims, and, consequently, that these claims are independently allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and should now be passed to issue.

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been requested separately, such extension is hereby requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees and to credit any overpayments that may be required by this paper under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 50-2036.

Respectfully submitted,

Baker & Hostetler LLP

July 30, 2009

Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-5304
Phone: (202) 861-1500; Fax: (202) 861-1783

By: _____
/ Adam M. Treiber /

Adam M. Treiber
Registration No. 48,000

#102871196